

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 and 20-25 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 6, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 21, and 22 have been amended as shown on pages 2-7 of the Reply.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Objection to Claims 1-5

Claims 1-5 are objected to because of minor informalities. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested in view of aforementioned amendment to claim 1 elaborating that the combination includes the unique identifier and the digitally encoded material.

II. Rejection of Claims 1, 5-6, 8-16, and 20-21 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 5-6, 8-16, and 20-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Shen *et al.* (US 2003/0149890). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for the following reasons. Shen *et al.* fails to teach or suggest each and every feature set forth in the subject claims of applicants' claimed invention.

The claimed subject matter provides for protection and tracking of information distributed in electronic form. To this end, amended independent claim 1 recites: *storing a list of processors that are permitted to execute the built-in functions; receiving information regarding a first processor attempting to execute one or more of the built-in functions; verifying if the first processor attempting to execute the built-in functions is on the list of processors; permitting the first processor to execute the one or more built-in functions if the processor is on the list else preventing the first processor from executing the one or more built-in functions.* Independent claim 6 recites *receiving information regarding a disparate processor accessing the built-in function source code for execution; allowing the disparate processor to execute a function associated with the built-in function source code if the disparate processor is included in a list of processors permitted to execute the function; barring the disparate processor from executing the function associated with the built-in function source code if the disparate processor is not included in the list of processor permitted to execute the function.* Independent claim 11 recites: *a list of processors associated*

with each or the built-in functions such that whenever a processor attempts to execute one or more of the built-in functions, it is verified if the processor is comprised within the list of processors before permitting the processor to carry out the one or more built-in functions, the processor is prevented from executing the one or more functions if it is not included in the list of processors associated with each of the one or more built-in functions. Independent claim 16 recites: *associating a list of processors with each of the built-in functions such that only processors in the list associated with a particular built-in function are permitted to execute the built-in function; receiving information regarding at least a processor attempting to render or transform the digitally encoded material via one or more of the built-in functions; verifying if the processor is included in the list associated with each of the one or more built-in functions; and rendering or transforming the digitally-encoded material based on the built-in functions, if the processor is included in the list, wherein the digitally-encoded material can be transformed and rendered only by the built-in functions.* Independent claim 21 recites similar features. Shen *et al.* is silent regarding such claim features.

Shen *et al.* relates to identical content to be protected by different IPMP systems, and an application enabling content protected utilizing an intellectual property management and protection (IPMP) system, to be used by a different IPMP system. In order to achieve such a system, Shen *et al.* discloses storing IPMP tool information in addition to a content identifier in a specific single packet at the beginning of the actual content stream. This IPMP tool information packet contains information regarding type of IPMP tool used for content protection, IPMP tool location type, and location from where the IPMP tool can be retrieved (See Shen *et al.* paragraphs [0009] – [0012]). Although Shen *et al.* discloses user authentication for an IPMP terminal, it discloses a content agent issuing a user license after completing user authentication. Nowhere does Shen *et al.* teach or suggest that a list of processors be maintained for each of the functions that can be carried out for the digitally encoded medium and permitting the functions to be carried out only if a processor attempting to execute the function is in the list of processors. The claimed subject matter facilitates flexibly assigning rights to specific processors by associating a list of processors to each function that can be carried out with a digitally encoded material. Thus, if a processor attempts to execute functions such as copy/paste or even print, it can be verified if such functionality is permitted for that specific processor before allowing the processor to complete the function. (See applicants' specification as filed Fig. 4 and related text

at [0030]-[0031]). Shen *et al.* is silent regarding such claim features.

In view of at least the foregoing, it can be concluded that Shen *et al.* fails to teach or suggest an identical invention as recited in the subject claims. Hence, this rejection should be withdrawn with respect to independent claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 21 and all claims depending therefrom.

III. Rejection of Claims 2-3, 17, and 22-23 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 2-3, 17, and 22-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shen *et al.* (US 2003/0149890) and further in view of Matsuyama *et al.* (US 6,574,611). Claims 2-3, 17 and 22-23 depend from independent claims 1, 16 and 21. As discussed supra, Shen *et al.* fails to teach or suggest all features recited by independent claims 1, 16 and 21. Matsuyama *et al.* relates to an information providing medium that performs the processing of registering users and their information processing apparatuses into content-providing systems, and fails to make up for the deficiencies of Shen *et al.* with respect to independent claims 1, 16 and 21. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection should be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection of Claims 4 and 7 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 4 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shen *et al.* (US 2003/0149890) and further in view of Rabinovitch (US 2006/0101521). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claims 4 and 7 depend from independent claims 1 and 6. As discussed supra, Shen *et al.* fails to teach or suggest all features recited by independent claims 1 and 6. Rabinovitch *et al.* relates to a system and method for secure usage right management of digital products, but fails to make up for the deficiencies of Shen *et al.* with respect to independent claims 1 and 6. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection should be withdrawn.

V. Rejection of Claims 24-25 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 24-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shen *et al.* (US 2003/0149890), Matsuyama *et al.* (US 6,574,611), and Rabinovitch (US 2006/0101521) as applied to claim 10, and further in view of Nelson (US 6,691,229). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claims 24-25 depend

from independent claims 21. As discussed *supra*, Shen *et al.* and Matsuyama *et al.* fail to disclose or suggest all features recited by independent claim 21. Rabinovitch *et al.* relates to a system and method for secure usage right management of digital products, but fails to make up for the deficiencies of Shen *et al.* with respect to independent claim 21. Nelson relates to preparing traceable copies of digital content and a method of adding a unique identifier to the digitally encoded content in a manner which does not alter the intended effect of the content, and fails to make up for the deficiencies of Shen *et al.*, Matsuyama *et al.*, and Rabinovitch with respect to independent claim 21. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP1150US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,
TUROC & WATSON, LLP

/Bhavani Rayaprolu/
Bhavani Rayaprolu
Reg. No. 56,583

TUROC & WATSON, LLP
127 Public Square
57TH Floor, Key Tower
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731